

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are pending. By this response, claims 1, 2, 5 and 9 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

#### **Allowable Claims**

Applicants note that claims 2-5 have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants note that claims 2 and 5 have been amended to include the features of claim 1 thereby making them independent claims. Claims 2 and 5 are now in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 1 and 9 previously indicated as allowable but withdrawn due to secondary interpretation of *Kanada* and *Wakabayashi*, Applicants note that these two claims have been amended to further define the bearing hole shape. Specifically, the claims define a shape from the bearing hole's center to the bearing hole's openings being a cone shape such that a diameter of the bearing hole's openings is larger than that of the bearing hole's center. Thus, the diameter is not the same throughout the entire bearing hole, since it has a cone shape from the center to the opening. These amendments should overcome the secondary interpretation of *Kanada* and *Wakabayashi* teachings. Applicants submit that claims 1 and 9 are in condition for allowance. Formal arguments are presented below.

#### **Prior Art Rejections**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kanada* (US 6,757,236) in view of *Wakabayashi et al.* (US 5,905,255) and claims 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kanada*, *Wakabayashi* and *Nii* (US 6,574,186). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that Kanada and Wakabayashi teach bearing holes in which the diameter measured from direct points on opposite sides of the bearing hole **do not** increase from the center to the hole opening. Kanada and Wakabayashi teach the diameter as being the same along the entire length of the bearing hole.

In contrast, Applicants claim a bearing hole “is formed such that a shape from the bearing hole’s center to the bearing hole’s openings is a cone shape that a diameter of the bearing hole’s openings is larger than that of the bearing hole’s center.” Applicants submit, as stated above, that Wakabayashi fails to teach the diameter of the bearing hole gradually increasing from center to the opening which would be the case in the cone shape in which the bearing holes opening is larger than the center.

Thus, the combination of Kanada and Wakabayashi fail to teach each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 9 as required. Further, Nii fails to remedy the deficiencies of Wakabayashi and Kanada as it is provided to teach aspects of the dependent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 20, 2007 (Monday)

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Chad J. Billings

Registration No.: 48,917

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant